



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,102	11/19/2003	Philip George Skeba	20103/A00482-1	7311
83417	7590	05/27/2009		
AT&T Legal Department - HFZ ATTN. Patent Docketing One AT&T Way Room 2A-207 Bedminster, NJ 07921			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, PHUC H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/717,102	Applicant(s) SKEBA ET AL.
	Examiner PHUC H. TRAN	Art Unit 2416

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22,24,25 and 38-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22,24,25 and 38-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22, 24, 25, 38, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5909463) and Gitlin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6064662) in further view of Maag et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5892833).

- With respect to claims 24 and 25, Johnson teaches a multiple channel system for a twisted pair telephone wire local loop system (e.g. Fig. 1 shows the wire local loop), comprising: a subscriber gateway system has a first transceiver connected to the twisted pair telephone wire, the first transceiver sending and receiving multiple independent channels (e.g. block 38 in Fig. 1); concave

an second transceiver at a central office connected to the twisted pair telephone wire, the second transceiver sending and receiving multiple independent channels (block 12 in Fig. 1); and a plurality of digital filters, operatively coupled to the first and second transceivers (e.g. block 6, 22, 34 and 48 in Fig. 1). Johnson fails to teach to convey a signal via an available frequency band associated with the multiple independent channels. Gitlin teaches the signal into an available frequency band (see fig. 6 of Gitlin and col. 4, lines 43-45) for transmitting signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the method of signals into the available frequency band in

order to transmit in channels; further comprising a digital subscriber line access multiplexer coupled to an output of the second transceiver (e.g. ADSL in Fig. 1). Johnson and Gitlin fail to teach the sum of plurality of digital filters. Maag teaches the sum of plurality of digital filter (e.g. Fig. 6A) for producing waveform of the frequency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the sum of plurality of digitals filters into the digital filter of Johnson for producing waveform of the frequency.

- With respect to claim 22, Johnson teaches a digital subscriber line access multiplexer couple to an output of the second transceiver (e.g. Fig. 5, and fig. 8).
- With respect to claim 38, Johnson teaches wherein the first transceiver in the subscriber gateway is to transmit a plurality of frequency division multiplexed signals (e.g. Frequency domain discloses in Fig. 3 and 4).
- With respect to claim 39, Johnson discloses wherein the first transceiver in the subscriber gateway is to transmit a plurality of time division multiplexed signals (e.g. Fig. 3 shows the IFFT form frequency to time domain).
- With respect to claim 41, Johnson teaches further comprising a local circuit switch coupled to an output of the second transceiver (e.g. the output interface in Fig. 3).

3. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5909463) and Gitlin and Maag in further view of Palm (U.S. Patent No. 6735245).

- Johnson fails to teach transmits a plurality of CDMA signal. Palm teaches the CDMA (col. 10, lines 19-22) for providing greater bandwidth capacity, less interference and protection. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the CDMA into Johnson's system for protecting signal, less interference and greater bandwidth capacity.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22, 24-25, and 38- 41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The following claim 24 was indicated allowable by examiner in previous office action; however, these claims are unpatentable in view of new arts. Therefore, these indicated claims are withdrawn.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHUC H. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-3172. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHI PHAM can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHUC H TRAN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2416